REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended to further clarify the nature of the present invention as defined in that claim. New Claims 26 and 27 are added to define the method including further features of the present invention. Claims 1-10, 13-20, 26, and 27 remain in this application, with no claim previously allowed.

Claim 1 is amended to make clear that a subsequent boot of the application program (after default language settings have been set in response to the first boot of that program) will enable the language settings previously set as the default language settings for that application program.

Claims 1-6 are rejected as unpatentable over *Hetherington* (US 6,396,515) in view of newly-cited *Heath* (US 4,858,114). The rejection acknowledges that *Hetherington* does not teach determining if an execution of the application program is the first boot of the application module, but asserts that modifying *Hetherington* to include that missing feature would have been obvious in view of *Heath*. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that one of ordinary skill, upon knowing the teachings of *Hetherington* and *Heath*, would have been directed away from the combinations suggested by the Examiner in the present rejection.

Hetherington discloses a system for switching the language settings of an application, within a user interface, without requiring closing that application and starting a different executable version and without rebooting the operating system (column 2, lines 14-19). *Hetherington* describes his invention as "dynamic language switching (column 2, line 35)", by which changes in user-interface text are achieved dynamically without shutting down the underlying application, and in particular without requiring that a separate executable version of the application be employed. This allows users to

5

change user-interface display languages on the fly, and permits multiple users of an application to change the display language (column 4, lines 22-28). Although *Hetherington* mentions that language-specific file selection may be based on the current setting of a language property for the host data system (column 2, lines 47-49), (i.e., each boot resets the language-specific file), the user interface is reloaded with text from a different language-specific file pursuant to a language-change request, and <u>without closing the application or rebooting the operating system</u>.

Heath, in contrast with *Hetherington*, teaches modifying the application program to adapt to a <u>hardware</u> configuration different from that for which the application program was initially written (column 7, lines 15-18; column 8, lines 44-51). *Heath* accomplishes that result by providing a set of so-called exception tables, external to the application program, to allow using a single application-program package with a variety of different hardware configurations (column 3, lines 44-49). Upon initial loading of an application program on a particular hardware embodiment, *Heath* looks for the presence of a relevant exception table. If that exception table is not present, the system is initialized and the application program is loaded (column 7, lines 55-58). However, if such an exception table is present, each exception on that table is loaded into the application program during system initialization (column 7, lines 63-68). The application program thus is modified for use with a hardware configuration other than that for which the program was originally written (column 8, lines 44-54).

Comparing the respective teachings of *Hetherington* and *Heath*, the former reference teaches the desirability of a system allowing users to change user-interface language for an application on the fly, without either restarting the application or rebooting the operating system. *Heath*, on the other hand, teaches modifying the

6

application program if that program is initially loaded onto a hardware configuration other then that for which the program was initially written. Given those significant differences between *Hetherington* and *Heath*, in their intended purposes and their implementation, one of ordinary skill would have seen each reference teaching <u>away</u> <u>from</u> the teachings of the other reference. Providing an on-the-fly modification of user-interface language without reloading the application program or rebooting the system (as in *Hetherington*) is incompatible with modifying the application program (taught by *Heath*) in response to differing hardware configurations. A person of ordinary skill thus would have understood each reference as teaching *away from* the other, and thus would not have attempted to combine the mutually-incompatible teachings of those references. For those reasons, Claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over *Hetherington* in view of *Heath*.

Claims 7-10 and 13-20 are rejected as unpatentable over *Hetherington* in view of *Heath* and further in view of *Kim* (US 6,014,616). *Kim* is cited as teaching that the editing language for an application program may be set by an input locale, and that this setting occurs based on an IME. However, *Kim* does not address the incompatibility, discussed above, of *Heath* and *Hetherington*. Accordingly, the claims are patentable over the applied art for the reasons discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

New Claim 26 depends from Claim 1 and adds the limitation that the default language settings of the application program are set equal to the user interface language of the operating system — in response to determining a first boot— only if registry key values for the language setting of the application program are at a value equal to "Off" instead of "ExplicitOff". This feature of the present invention is discussed in the specification at page 10, lines 4-10 and page 11, lines 1-11. New Claim 27 depends from

Claim 19 and adds a similar limitation to that claim. The prior art applied to rejecting the claims fails to show or suggest a method including the limitations added by claims 26 and 27. Accordingly, those claims define patentable subject matter over the prior art for that additional reason.

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. The Applicant submits that all claims remaining in this application are in allowable condition and solicits a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD

Date: December 1, 2004

Roger T. Frost
Reg. No. 22,176

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE